



Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova - Republic of Kosovo



Agjencia e Kosovës për Akreditim
Agencija Kosova za Akreditaciju
Kosovo Accreditation Agency

University of Prishtina
Faculty of Education
EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (0-6 years), BA

ACCREDITATION

REPORT OF THE EXPERT TEAM



April 16, Prishtina

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	2
1. INTRODUCTION	3
1.1. Context	3
1.2. Site visit schedule	4
1.3. A brief overview of the institution and program under evaluation.....	4
2. PROGRAM EVALUATION	5
2.1. Mission, objectives and administration	5
2.2. Quality management.....	7
2.3. Academic staff.....	9
2.4. Educational process content	11
2.5. Students	14
2.6. Research	15
2.7. Infrastructure and resources.....	17
3. OVERALL EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE ET	18



1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Context

Date of site visit (on line): March 26, 2021

Expert Team (ET) members:

- Prof. Dr. Melita Kovacevic

Coordinators from Kosovo Accreditation Agency (KAA):

- Naim Gashi, Executive Director of KAA
- Shkelzen Gerxhaliu, Senior Officer for Monitoring and Evaluation
- Arianit Krasniqi, Senior Officer for Evaluation and Accreditation
- Leona Kovaçi, Senior Officer for Monitoring and Evaluation
- Ilirjane Ademaj, Senior Officer for Monitoring and Evaluation

Sources of information for the Report:

- Faculty of Education, Primaty Education, BA SER (Self Evaluation Report plus annexes);
- Meetings with management, staff, students, administrators, and graduates of the institution;
- Additional materials requested by the Expert

Criteria used for program evaluation:

- KAA Accreditation Manual



1.2. Site visit (on line) schedule

09.00 – 09.40	Meeting with the management of the faculty where the programme is integrated (<i>no slide presentation is allowed; the meeting is intended as a free discussion</i>) – joint session
09:45 – 10:25	Meeting with quality assurance representatives and administrative staff – joint session
10:30 – 11:10	Lunch break
11:00 – 12:10	Meeting with the heads of the study programme 1. Early Childhood Education (0-6 years), BA
12:15 – 13:15	Meeting with the heads of the study programme 2. Primary Education, BA
13:20 – 14:00	Meeting with teaching staff
14:05 – 14:45	Meeting with students
14:50 – 15:30	Meeting with graduates
15.35 – 16:15	Meeting with employers of graduates and external stakeholders
16.15 – 16:25	Internal meeting of KAA staff and experts
16:25 – 16:35	Closing meeting with the management of the faculty and program

1.3. A brief overview of the institution and programme under evaluation

University of Prishtina is the main national higher education institution, while the teacher education has a long history starting 1958. Going through different developmental changes and transformations on a national level, but also following reform in European Higher Education Area, including the Bologna process, today, Faculty of Education is one of a leading faculty for a teacher education on all levels in Kosovo. This is an institution with a tradition, but also creating new modernised programmes and making educational advancements in the national higher education. The Faculty of Education offers programmes at bachelor and master level: three bachelor programmes, preschool, primary and pedagogy; and seven master programmes as well as a doctoral programme in Education Sciences.



Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova - Republic of Kosovo



Agjencia e Kosovës për Akreditim
Agencija Kosova za Akreditaciju
Kosovo Accreditation Agency

The Faculty has dean and three vice deans, covering different areas of institutional functioning. It is evident that the new governance and management of the faculty are well informed about modern teacher education and their efforts to introduce and implement changes that will contribute to the overall quality are well recognised.

Programme that is in the evaluation process is Early Childhood Education, 0 to 6 years, the fifth programme that is the subject of accreditation, besides three other bachelor programmes (Preschool, Primary, and Pedagogy, as well as Early Childhood Education and Development, Age 0 to 3)). The programme (Early Childhood Education and Development, Age 0 to 3) has been submitted for the reaccreditation in 2017, but as a result of the evaluation process, the reaccreditation has not been granted.

2. PROGRAMME EVALUATION

2.1. Mission, objectives and administration

The mission of the study programme, according to the SER, is in line with the mission of the University of Prishtina, as well as with the mission of the Faculty of Education. It is focused on providing education that will prepare teachers for different levels of education as well as other specialists in the field of education to work in different educational, research and societal settings.

The missions of the Faculty of Education are reviewed regularly every 3 to 4 years and the process is conducted in cooperation with different stakeholders. They have well defined long-term objectives, and presently they are in a process of developing a new Strategy, for the period of next three years. This is definitely positive approach, however, the institution should consider to work on little bit longer planning, instead of developing strategies for such a short period. Strategical planning for a longer period will allow better monitoring and additional adjustments, and it will also require to develop adequate, applicable action plans, something that it does not happen presently. In other words, different approach would use time and energy of the Faculty and its staff more efficiently and more effectively.

It has been noticed the Dean also have well-articulated programme for his mandate, something that could definitely have a positive impact on overall institutional development. Another

5



Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova - Republic of Kosovo



Agjencia e Kosovës për Akreditim
Agencija Kosova za Akreditaciju
Kosovo Accreditation Agency

positive step toward faster development is better connection with the Institute for Development and Research in Education (IRDE), emphasizing the importance of Institute better functioning and providing an adequate setting for research activities.

The programme is aligned with NQF as well as it is in accordance with European Higher Education Area.

It does have well defined overarching didactic concept, though research is still weak and needs to be better blended with the curriculum. Most likely, the situation could change in a near future due to the fact that the Dean also has in his 4-year programme well-articulated so-called research clusters that should be reflected in more research activities of all the staff and their translation into teaching as well. Experience being supported financially by USAID and working on Transformational leadership program certainly triggered some positive changes.

The main mission of the Early Childhood Education programme is to provide a quality programme for the continuous preparation and training educators who will be competent for the professional work with preschool children, as stated in the SER. At the moment, Faculty implements two programmes, one is Preschool Education, the other is Early Childhood Education and Development (0 to 3), the programme which is closing down with its last generation of students. In other words, within this programme there is no more teaching, and students have only obligation to pass exams According to the additional information the Faculty provided (comments to the draft report) there is no intention to merge Preschool programme and the Early Childhood Education Programme. As they stated, the new programme is *rather an extension of the preschool programme*. Such a statement is not completely transparent regarding the content and institutional capacity. What is confusing for the evaluators, and not correctly stated across number of the provided documents, as well as the SER, the number of existing bachelor programmes, regardless of their present status. The reader needs to be very careful and concentrated to detect that there are four ongoing programmes (one only with some students who only have pending exams), and the fifth to be accredited for the first time. Though, this new programme, will in a way replace one that it has been closed down, there is no information how long the Preschool Education programme will go on, and in number of documents referring to different information there is no clear mirroring of all the existing programmes.



The programme follows institutional policies and regulations and assures to have them available for staff and students. There are also ethical regulations assuring ethical conduct in teaching, research and all activities within the Department and Programme. The Faculty, has a set of documents and regulations on different levels in order to review the study programmes, and in principal, as stated in the SER, number of those decisions and regulations and responsibilities surpasses the competence of the Faculty and they are centralised, on a level of the whole University. However, it has been noticed that the Faculty, and its programmes trying, within their limits, to develop number of activities to enhance a quality of teaching and staff performance. Nevertheless, up to now, there was no regular Programme review being implemented, at least every two year. According to additional information collected from the Faculty, the new policy framework, it is planned to apply annual review of all the programmes. This approach and regularity in reviewing the programme will facilitate quality assurance as well as it would accelerate to implement necessary changes.

Compliance level: Substantially compliant

ET recommendations:

- 1. Reconsider the necessity to better integrate research and to further develop its research concept relevant for the Programme in particular*
- 2. Implement programme reviewing annually or biannually, not only regarding quality of teaching, but the content of courses as well*

2.2. Quality management

Quality management meets majority of the standards as specified in the KAA accreditation manual. There are responsible staff for the quality management, there are procedures and all the staff as well as other main stakeholders are regularly involved in quality assuring processes. Quality office is in charge of implementing procedures, and to prepare and administer internal evaluation and student's evaluations. However, there is no evidence of regular self-evaluation of all the staff. Positively, the Faculty started to develop some of their internal actions, independently from the university, that might speed up some positive changes. This change and new planned activities would probably have a positive impact, in between other effects, on standard 2.9.



Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova - Republic of Kosovo



Agjencia e Kosovës për Akreditim
Agencija Kosova za Akreditaciju
Kosovo Accreditation Agency

According to the SER and interviews, it has been noticed that staff participate in formal and informal reviews of student data and curriculum design. They also confirmed that the student evaluation processes were consistent and understood by both staff and students, and that they had personally benefitted from these quality assurance mechanisms. The missing aspect is continuous and regular analysis of all the element of the process (not only being focused on students' evaluations) which will significantly contribute to regular adjustments in the programme. Since there are actually two programmes going on, one Preschool Education, the other Early Childhood Education and Development, for the accreditation process as well as for the institutional (and Programme development) would be beneficial to be more reflexive on the existing programmes and more explicit how the fusion of two programmes will be implemented. It is not clear what are the lesson learned, and how it will be reached to establish a new, one programme of better quality. Based on all the documents, SER and other sources of information, it has been said very little, if anything, how the Faculty will handle on one side temporary existence of more programmes, and on the other, how the mergence will happen, in particular bearing in mind the quality aspect. Nevertheless, regular evaluations and follow up, monitoring are the prerequisite for faster and better adjustments. Establishing and opening a new programme is always a challenge for an institution, but it is even more demanding to navigate between closing down some programmes, bringing a generation of students to the end following the already existing programme and, finally, starting the new one. Institution as well as all the academic staff needs to be aware of such demanding academic situation.

Positive change at the level of the Faculty is the new policy framework which foresees number of activities to assure better quality and to improve quality management. Some of those activities started to be implemented for the first time, some of them are planned and they supposed to become a regular. This is the result of a new management and proactive leadership, which has a good potential.

What is learned about the system, is that the results from the evaluations are not fully available publicly and the data from the gradates and employers are not collected and analysed sufficiently. Staring a new programme (though based on already existing ones) requires the institution to build in the system new procedures and actions. This is one more reason why it is important to have a well-developed Action plan, covering all the aspect of institutional functioning. On a declarative level, there is a regular communication between teachers and employers or those stakeholders where students have a practical work, however in practice this does not work always this way. In addition, it has been learned from other programmes that



there is not sufficient monitoring and follow up of activities performed outside the Faculty. Again, each student doing a practical work should be monitored on site both by staff from those preschools-institutions, but also by one designated teacher from the Faculty. Unfortunately, some students are never visited/monitored directly by his/her designated teacher while performing a practical work. Practical work for this kind of educational programmes are extremely relevant for the overall quality, and institutions needs to plan and monitor these activities and/or part of the Programme very carefully.

Compliance level: Partially compliant

ET recommendations:

- 1. It would be of utmost relevance to reflect on the existing programmes and to prepare merge of two programmes very carefully*
- 2. A proper SWOT analysis of the two existing programmes could facilitate establishment of a new one*
- 3. It is important to apply regular monitoring and follow up of all QA processes*
- 4. It is necessary to implement regular staff self-evaluations*
- 5. Special attention should be payed to the content of the courses and their complementary with the overall programme*
- 6. Survey data collection must include employers and graduates as well*

2.3. Academic staff

Faculty of Education, being a part of University of Prishtina, does not have issues with a number of full-time staff employed and their basic academic qualifications. Faculty, as a member of the University of Prishtina, has established procedures for selection as well as academic promotions, followed with adequate regulations and standards.

However, as it has been also reported in the SER, with no doubt, one of the weaknesses is the ratio of students-teacher, on one side, and the total number of teaching hours per teacher, on the other. According to the SER as well additional data and explanations received from the Faculty, it seems that the teaching load more or less follows the institutional and national regulations. However, there are two important moments that need to be considered. Firstly, the additionally sent tables do not have listed all the programmes that are ongoing (e.g. in the Table



Staff teaching load per programme, all the programmes /existing and the possible new one- are not listed). Secondly, there is no clear presentation what will happen if the new programme is accredited and starts its programme in a Fall, while the old ones still cannot close down fully because of the existing students. This actually means for certain number of years there will be even heavier teaching load. This is not even reflected in the institutional/programme SWOT analysis. Does this mean that there are no clear plans and awareness of a serious issue of a teaching load? According to the comments received by the Faculty to the draft report, *there will be no additional burden on the teaching hours of the academic staff... and ... the management and ECD programme heads have carefully analysed this issue and is drafting a detailed plan for phasing out the new programme in parallel to implementing the new one*, it is not possible in this phase to identify reliable evidence for such a statement.

On the other side, even the presented data are within the institutional limits, the system needs to be aware that the teaching load, either for some categories of teaching staff or in some individual cases, is generally too big. It would be the role of each institution-programme to try to lower such teaching loads that definitely could have a negative impact on overall quality, but also, for example, to allow very little if any space for research. Although, formally according to the institutional regulations academic staff is not allowed to be engaged in other institutions-programmes, and this does not happen, standard 3.3. is evaluated negatively because of too big teaching load per person (now is already within the limit not considering parallelism of old and new programmes) which in number of cases would be equivalent as to be employed/teach at least at two institutions. This aspect of functioning asks for careful rethinking how to manage all the programmes with the available staff. The present situation surely does not contribute to the overall quality of teaching and the programmes.

Nevertheless, it seems that the majority of academic staff selected for this programme is committed individuals who are devoted to programme development and also create good atmosphere working with the students. Still, it has been noticed during the interviews that there are some generation differences, some staff members being more type of ‘ex cathedra’ teachers and a bit more conservative, keeping distance from the students, and those who are more flexible and lowering the distance between them and students. Although presently we are evaluating a programme which is still not implemented, considering the fact that the new programme will be based on the two existing ones, information gathered during the interviews are considered relevant. There is a sufficient balance between younger and more experienced staff on the programme.



It also appears that the Programme meets the basic minimum standards required in Standards 3.2, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.9 and 3.10 in the KAA Accreditation Manual.

Staff professional development it has been developed, in particular through implementation of some European projects and collaboration with other international universities, in particular is relevant support by the University of Indiana, USA. Up to now the institution has organised trainings and courses mainly with the support of others, with a significant positive impact as reported in the SER. However, it would be of the utmost importance to develop those courses/trainings with their own capacities and to make them regularly available in order to avoid a gap that might happen once the support of others stops. Also, according to the SER, it is still noticed that not all the staff is equally motivated to participate and further mechanisms to balance the staff participation is needed.

In light of Standards 3.8, it seems relevant to stress the importance for internal quality to do staff evaluations regularly involving different stakeholders and to make them publicly available. It would have been interesting, now, before merging to programmes to have information from such activity.

Compliance level: Substantially compliant

ET recommendations:

- 1. To provide better analysis of teaching load across different programmes*
- 2. To rethink how to lower the number of teaching hours per staff member in order to enhance quality and open possibility for other academic activities as well*
- 3. To organise their own more frequent and fit to the specific needs' trainings for staff*
- 4. To develop mechanism to involve as many as possible staff members*

2.4. Educational process content

The aimed programme is focused on early education of children, actually infants, till their start of the primary education (for which another programme exists). First thing that could be noticed is the given age of children in the focus, already in the title. As it has been suggested in the previous reaccreditation process of the programme Early Child Education and



Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova - Republic of Kosovo



Agjencia e Kosovës për Akreditim
Agencija Kosova za Akreditaciju
Kosovo Accreditation Agency

Development, Age 0 to 3, this is not needed, it is not common, and not very ‘practical’ when the title needs to be written. However, the other objections were related to the missing content of courses, if there is a really intention to work with children younger than 1 year, with the infants. Neither of these two objections was considered, the age period stayed in the title (less relevant), but with keeping this concept of targeting very young children, infants, new-borns there is no appropriate course selection. The content of the courses does not cover the needs and knowledge absolutely needed for working with infants. To be more radical, we could say that missing a particular knowledge while working with that age of children could jeopardise infant’s safety and wellbeing. Education in its core meaning would even not have a chance to come in focus.

If the age of children would be from 1 to 6, we could say that the curriculum is relatively well composed, having the balance between obligatory and elective course. Still, some improvements should be taken into consideration. According to the SER, two programmes are provided, one from University of Ljubljana and one from University of Rijeka (unfortunately, the provided website is not correct one). Although, the other programme is three years, it offers sufficient number of courses that are relevant for working with young children. In the programme that is in the process of evaluation it seems that some course titles could be defined in a more ‘elegant’ way (e.g. there is no need to say Education through Drama and Puppet play, it would be enough Drama and Puppet play; or some courses are more like topics-themes, not the name discipline- e.g. Partnership with Family and Community etc.). The course, e.g. Step by Step methodology, is not a part of any discipline, it is not based on a theoretical work, and although it might be interesting for students and its content could find the application, it is hard to justify it as a regular university course. Just the fact that the main literature is based on booklets from the Soros Foundation conveys the message that this is something popular, pragmatic, and as such not the basis for the university course.

Generally, without going one by one course (although this argumentation could be also provided), and taking a future perspective, some of the courses need to be revisited and to be presented and structured in a more appropriate way: there are examples where the list of literature is not appropriate (from two long list of more than two, sometimes three textbooks and other titles to be considered as basic literature (number of courses); to appearance of something that it could not be taken as a basic literature at all / educational cartoon book, while in the course description, the teacher is emphasizing theoretical work and background (e.g. ICT for Education); or for two different course (e.g. Albanian language I and Albanian language II,

12



Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova - Republic of Kosovo



Agjencia e Kosovës për Akreditim
Agencija Kosova za Akreditaciju
Kosovo Accreditation Agency

the same outcomes, same course aims, almost the same literature etc.); regarding the distribution of ECTS it could be also questioned what was the logic behind it; or, for example, how for one of the listed courses (e.g. Practical Practice IV) allocated ECTS is 3+0, and then in the workload students has 3 hours of lecturing each week, and 6 hours of practical work (what is the logic behind having so heavy load of lecturing with demanding practical work). All in all, even the final number of ECTS and workload expressed in hours fits, the distribution is questionable and not clear. Very similar comments were given in the previous evaluation process, and although it seems that the overall programme is better structured, it seems that the Programme provider did not pay enough attention to number of suggestions.

The study programme follows NQF as well as EHEA and complies with the Erasmus Subject Area Codes (ESAC). The programme follows Bologna scheme, although it is 4-year programme with 60 ECTS per year.

As previously commented upon, the program is well offering among obligatory and elective courses, however the distribution of ECTS still requires revisiting. The programme offers students to choose courses that will build up their skills and competencies. The programme has listed 11 learning outcomes. However, regarding the standard 4.5 there are some difficulties, articulated both by teaching staff as well as students, and according the SER. Although students entering the programme have an opportunity to choose course for English learning, and they have an opportunity to receive free language course at the institutional level, absorbing literature in English still might be an issue, at least for some students.

Standards 4.7. and 4.9 in order to be fully met require the additional efforts from the Programme provider. It should be made a better alignment between the course aim and description, teaching methods, allocation of ECTS-working load and literature. The students and staff mentioned that the atmosphere in classes is positive and encouraging, and students mentioned that they felt comfortable with the student-teacher interactions. They also noted that they felt comfortable with the basic assessment mechanisms used. But, as noticed earlier, some differences in style and accessibility is linked to different generations of teachers.

Standard 4.11 is not met, and the main concern is related to practical work. It is not confirmed that all the students receive the same level of monitoring and attention by their designated mentors, although formally this criterion is met. Of course, this statement is based on

13



experience of students in the existing programme, not for the new one which supposed to start next academic year. In addition, as it has been mentioned earlier, some changes in the courses devoting to practical work needs to be considered.

Compliance level: Partially compliant

ET recommendations:

1. *Consider of leaving out from the title the age period*
2. *Consider in the description of the programme that the focused group of children are from age 1 to 6 (see the comparative study you provided)*
3. *If you keep the same period it would be necessary to enrich the programme with necessary courses for working with infants*
4. *Revisit the courses syllabi and their overall description*
5. *Reconsider the allocated ECTS to individual courses*
6. *Special attention should be payed to the content of the courses and their complementary with the overall programme*
7. *Put more emphasis on learning foreign language (English)*
8. *Consider to offer and-or introduce additional generic courses*

2.5. Students

The students who participated during the on-line site visit were supportive, satisfied and generally very positive about the study programme they are enrolled, but it is important to stress that those were students of the programme which is actually closing down. They were positive about the curriculum, but also teachers, and field in general. As it has been already mentioned, students did express their interest to have some courses better fitted to the need of a Programme (and the targeted recipients of education – children of certain age).

The admission procedure seems to be clear, but it seems that it is still an issue to have well organised and available data on enrolment, completion etc. According to number of students and available staff, it seems that the intake is still too big (or too many programmes in total). The total number of students at the Faculty and available staff is definitely not the preferred one, and for a couple of years it will be even more issue of capacity when two programmes



will be parallel, and with around 100 students still being in the process, not completing the Early Child Education and Development programme.

Students reported that they receive the feedback from their teachers and that they can approach teachers with no problems., though some differences among different generations of teachers are noted.

Students and staff agreed that the assessment mechanisms and grades are understood and are fairly applied. (Standards 5.4. and 5.5).

Standard 5.8 has not fully met yet. Although there are institutional regulations and committees dealing with misconduct, it appears to be no clear system to examine the originality of student work, and that burden falls upon teacher, primarily. However, according to the obtained information, a tool for plagiarism has been purchased on the level of the whole institution and the practice will be soon changed. Most of the evaluators for number of programmes were pleading to get such a tool, and it is pleasure to know that this positive step has been done.

Students and staff both verified that the students' rights and obligations were clearly understood, and that these were consistently upheld and supported. The students (and graduates) expressed an understanding of how to appeal disputed grades.

Academic staff expressed an understanding of, and willingness to comply with, requirements for student consultation and staff availability. Academic staff and students' statements matched.

Compliance level: Substantially compliant

ET recommendations:

1. *Assure technical support for plagiarism detection, preferable by purchasing a software*
2. *Motivate students to study English*
3. *More closely follow the completion rate and assure data for the cohorts of students*

2.6. Research

Research objectives of the study programme follow the institutional strategy and it is intertwined within the programme, on one side, and reflected in staff activities on the other. It

15



Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova - Republic of Kosovo



Agjencia e Kosovës për Akreditim
Agencija Kosova za Akreditaciju
Kosovo Accreditation Agency

is also relevant to add that the research objectives are also specified in Dean's programme. It seems that the Faculty and the Programme are trying to improve research activities that exist, but more collective and institutional efforts are needed.

Academic staff are required to participate actively in the research community, usually as demonstrated by attendance at conferences or the publication of scholarly articles. The academic staff all seemed aware of this requirement and did not express any particular objections to this requirement. They noted that this is an almost universal expectation in higher education employment. However, it has to be emphasized again, that with high teaching load and being stretched among number of programmes (so, the human resources are still an issue, and /or too big intake of students, and-or offering too many programmes) it is very hard to keep up with research and to research productive. And, of course, overall financial situation in Kosovo does not facilitate the whole process of enriching research at academic institutions.

The publication rate does not meet Standard 6.7, which specifies at least one publication per year. While reading all the documents that accompanied the SER. Similarly, as for the other programme, available data were not presented in transparent and friendly way for a reader, but after thorough analysis, it became evident that ten staff members do not meet basic criteria. It would be important to internalise ways of citations, writing references, preparing CVs etc. which will also contribute to the institutional-programme visibility. In addition, it is crucial to develop research culture where it is not the main goal to meet minimal criteria without respecting quality in research. In other words, it is of utmost relevance to develop mechanisms to support publishing in relevant international publications, instead in predatory journals or to list only abstracts as published papers. Standard 6.8 was not really confirmed, at least not completely, because authors primarily publish under their names. And the institution is mentioned if required. Evidently, an institutional policy is missing to raise the awareness how important is to always cite the name of the institutions as one of the main indicators of the institutional visibility.

Although there are institutional regulations for ownership of intellectual property, procedures are still not fully developed. At the same time, very little is focused on possible innovations and intellectual property in social sciences, and although students in their Programme can choose a course related to entrepreneurial skills, it requires further clarifications and work on possibilities to be innovative in the field.



Students do participate in research, they also do it as a part of their study work, and it is evident that academic staff translate their research into teaching activities and work with students, although there is still a space to intensify these activities (standard 6.9 and 6.11).

Recently, Faculty allocated a special budget for some research activities and, most likely, some concrete positive outcome will be able to be noticed in next accredited period. It seems that faculty management as majority of staff members identified research as weak, but important area of their performance.

Compliance level: Partially compliant

ET recommendations:

1. *Consider developing mechanisms for raising research productivity, by defining more focused research topics, form small research groups (instead individual approach) and develop internal criteria, in addition to the institutional*
2. *Pay a special attention to publish in recognised international publications*
3. *Improve soft skills of academic staff and consider offering courses/trainings to facilitate this process*
4. *Consider small, but publishable research with students and/or graduates*

2.7. Infrastructure and resources

Faculty of Education as a part of University of Prishtina has adequate facilities and staff, human resources. It has multiple classrooms appropriate to the programme, furnished with necessary equipment and reasonable class sizes. Students also have on disposal a library and computers, although it should be noted that availability of literature has been issue for many years, not only for this Programme. This is an area for which the whole system, within the institution and outside, will have to pay more attention and find a way to resolve this problem. The administrative and management offices are located in the same building, making assistance easy for student or staff. The staff and administration are adequate to support the programme.

Department, and programme, do not have a three-year financial planning, but this is due to the centralised institutional system in which University is responsible for assuring regular sustainable financing. Apparently, the Programme has this support, but still missing this kind of financial transparency.



Standard 7.3 is met, although we are aware that the institution/Programme has an issue with access to recent literature. However, the same issue has been evidenced within the standard 7.5. What is relevant that the Faculty has adequate and sufficient space to accommodate students and the Programme. As, in many other instances, there is always a challenge for a programme to have enough recent literature, both books and journals, that all the student's access. The system still relies significantly on individual efforts and individual staff arrangements. Standard 7.4 is met, in that the lecture rooms are comfortable and well structured.

Infrastructure and other facilities respond to the program implementation requirements for students with special needs (7.6)

Compliance level: Substantially compliant

ET recommendations:

1. *Focus on increasing number of relevant titles, and decreasing the literature availability depending on individual teacher*
2. *Be proactive in using plagiarism software which has been purchased*
3. *Identify a research database that is appropriate for the program's support and development.*

3. OVERALL EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE ET

The ET would like to thank the main Programme representatives, especially to the Dean, Vice Deans and programme responsible staff. The ET would also like to acknowledge the time, insights, and contributions of the programme staff, students, and graduates.

In conclusion, the Expert Team considers that the BA programme Early Childhood Education (0-6 years) is substantially compliant with the standards included in the *KAA Accreditation manual* and, therefore, recommends to accredit the study program for a duration of 3 year. The first-year intake of new students should not be more than 60 students. It should be followed till

18



Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova - Republic of Kosovo



Agjencia e Kosovës për Akreditim
Agencija Kosova za Akreditaciju
Kosovo Accreditation Agency

both other programmes (Preschool Education and Early Childhood Education and Development do not close down completely and students finish attending courses).

Expert Team

Chair

	Melita Kovacevic	April 16
(Signature)	(Print Name)	(Date)

Member

(Signature)	(Print Name)	(Date)
-------------	--------------	--------

Member

(Signature)	(Print Name)	(Date)
-------------	--------------	--------

Member

19



Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova - Republic of Kosovo



Agjencia e Kosovës për Akreditim
Agencija Kosova za Akreditaciju
Kosovo Accreditation Agency

(Signature)

(Print Name)

(Date)

Member

(Signature)

(Print Name)

(Date)

Member

(Signature)

(Print Name)

(Date)